

Ser. No. 09/719,147
Customer No. 24498

PF980034

Remarks/Arguments

Claims 1, 3-8, and 11-13 are pending. The claims have been amended to more clearly and distinctly claim the subject matter that applicants regard as their invention. No new matter is believed to be added by the present amendment.

Rejection of claims 1-8 and 11-13 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goertzel et al (US Pat No 6,208,952)

Applicants submit that for at least the reasons discussed below amended claims 1, 3-8 and 11-13 are patentably distinguishable over the teachings of Goertzel et al.

The teachings of Goertzel have been discussed in detail in applicants' previous response. For the reasons stated therein and discussed further below, applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's analysis and application of Goertzel. Goertzel describes a system in which a client communicates with a server through a number of processes, all of which may or may not be used depending on the circumstances. However, to move the prosecution of this case forward, applicants have amended the independent claims to include the limitations of previous claim 2. That is, claim 1 has been amended to recite:

-receiving, by the second device, a request from said first device for opening a connection between the first device and the second device, wherein said request contains an internet application protocol Identifier, corresponding to a protocol chosen among a plurality of protocols supported by the second device, to identify an internet application protocol to be used for exchanging information between the first device and an internet server, said request also including a message buffer size allocated to message reception by the first device for the connection on the first network (emphasis added)

Claims 11 and 12 have been amended to similarly recite the above emphasized feature of claim 1. Applicants submit that nowhere does Goertzel, et al, teach or suggest the above-emphasized limitation of the amended claims.

In the outstanding Office Action, the examiner alleges that the subject matter of claim 2 is disclosed in Goertzel on columns 6-9. Column 6 describes the components of the server and client systems. Columns 7-9 describe the flow diagrams of figures 4-10, and the block diagram of figure 11. However, applicants

Ser. No. 09/719,147
Customer No. 24498


PF980034

have carefully reviewed the teachings of columns 6-9 and are unable to find any teaching or suggestion of the recited feature in these cited portions. Should the examiner maintain the view that the recited feature is disclosed in Goertzel, applicants respectfully request that the exact portions of Goertzel that describe the feature is cited in detail so that applicants can more fully address the examiner's concerns.

Having fully addressed the Examiner's rejections it is believed that, in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly then, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicant's attorney at (609) 734-6815, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

Respectfully submitted,

G. Bichot, et al.

By: 
Paul P. Kiel
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 40,677

THOMSON Licensing LLC
PO Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312

Date: 6/25/07